193 From the most cursory examination of the Mataco or Mataguayo, or Nocten tongue it is evident that it is a language which prefixes its pronominal particles, while the Lule has just as strong a bent towards suffixing them.

This fact alone is sufficient to separate Mataco from Lule with a barrier which is not to be bridged by Father Machoni's brief and indirect reference. This does not mean that I deny that Mataco and Lule may share common words—these analogies will be noted later—but the grammatical mechanism and the pronouns themselves point in absolutely opposite directions.

197 [114]

Following the classification which we have been setting down in this study, Mataco corresponds to the Atlantic type insofar as the position of affixes is concerned, although it is my impression that it leans more closely towards the Moja branch than towards the Guaraní, in spite of the greater immediacy of the latter.

Before proceeding further let us examine the arguments on which Machoni rests his hypothesis that the Tonocoté of Techo and others is really Lule:

114 197

In the first place the Lule language is not widespread but limited to the five nations: Lule, Isistiné, Toquistiné, Oristiné (1)

> 1. The Missionaries of whom Hervas made enquiries deny that there be Oristinés.

and Tonocoté. The Tonocotés numbered 60,000 souls. (Machoni's prologue.)

Secondly, the Tonocotés in the XVII century lived near Concepción del Bermejo and were evangelized by Fathers Bárcena and Anasco. These Indians taking offense at the Spaniards, went off to the banks of the Yabebirí and Pilcomayo Rivers. Ibid.

Thirdly the Lules, Isistinés, Toquistines and Oristinés were evangelized by Fathers Bárcena, Monroy and Viana in 1589 and visited by Saint Francisco Solano. Ibid.

In the fourth place the Isistinés, Toquistinés and Oristinés fled to the Chaco and there remained for over a hundred years until in 1710 they came before don Esteban de Urizar y Arespacochaga who placed them in the Valbuena and Miraflores reservations; Father Machoni was with them for 9 years. [617]

able to extract a few rules from them after having written them 124
down as it seemed to me that they sounded.

One day the son of a chief stopped by and I began to ask 124
him the names of all the parts of his body. Naked as he was there 193
was no possibility of confusing these parts of the body with the clothing associated with them.

Hardly had he finished when I perceived that each one of those fifteen or twenty words began, without exception, with nu or no, the u and the o substituting each other frequently, the difference in sound being hardly perceptible.

"Well I'll be...!" I said to myself. This nu is either an article or a relating particle, for it is not conceivable that so many words have the same root. It didn't seem likely to me that it was an article, but nevertheless I remembered that when I was a boy and I was asked by someone to name the parts of my face I used to answer using the article, and saying -- for example: "the mouth, the eye," etc. Why could these Indians not be just as childish as I?

I very soon had my doubts resolved. I asked him the same questions with reference to my own body, and he repeated the words he had given me, but changing the nu to a, and sometimes a few of the other letters which followed after the nu. It was as though a bolt of lightning had suddenly illumined my understanding -- but doubt returning, and being very desirous to get to the bottom of this problem, I took advantage of the occasion of my having caught a chimango [kite-like bird--Translator] and asked the same questions about the various parts of its body. In the answers I was given, many of the words began with lu or lo, but remained otherwise pretty much the same as those pertaining to man, minus that famous nu or a.

The following conclusion, almost concrete and tangible in 193
its clarity, flashed before me: So the Matacos prefix a variable particle to their radical words, and this particle probably expresses a relationship. But what relationship?...I searched again through my notes, especially among the phrases and sentences and found that on every occasion when reference was made to the person who was talking the term began [235] with nu; if reference was to the person spoken to, with a, and if to a third person, then with lu or lo.

It was a revelation to me. It was a key which opened up 193 ● for me the secret of a large stage upon which were to be found the explanations of the meaning of a great number of words; it was the compass which allowed me to find the right way as I traversed the labyrinth of phrases.

What a pleasurable experience that was!

These particles are not prefixed only to nouns, but also to verbs, and to adjectives when need arises. They even go so far as to overuse them pleonastically, as we so often do with certain particles in relaxed conversation; a phenomenon which is even more pronounced in untutored usage.

Following hard upon this discovery and attempting to find out something further regarding the way these particles were used, I came upon something which confirmed my previous induction: nu is a syncopation of nuj-ca, which means "mine"; a is a syncopation of aj-ca, meaning "yours"; and lu is a shortened form of luj-co, meaning "his," "of him." This is when these particles are prefixed to nouns. When prefixed to verbs they may be considered, respectively, as syncopations of noj-c-lam, signifying "I" ' am or ham, meaning "you"; and lutzi or toj-lutzi, meaning "he" or "that one." With verbs, toj is preferred to lu, and means "this one" when isolated, while toj-sam and toj-lani mean "that one," and toj-licne and toj-lei-tzi mean "that one yonder."

Is this inter-compatibility between personal pronoun, personal adjective and particle indicating personal relation not beautiful and at the same time simple and useful?

Was it possible that such a language could have lacked rules? All this built up my interest and egged me on to further efforts.

Accustomed as we are in our language to find, as a general rule, the root and the unchangeable part of words at the beginning, the finding of the very opposite here was enough to drive one mad until some canon could be found which would explain matters. This being so, the following rule of thumb ought always to be followed when attempting to study a language which does not have a written grammar: forget every rule which holds for one's own language -- if this is not done it will be as difficult to hit upon the right solution as it is to recognize a person who is wearing a mask.

constructions. In what way can it be said that they are behind other languages? 192 196

[244] Thus for Venus they employ the same verbal image as we and the Latins do, that is lucero ["morning star"--Translator] ijuála-hu, "mother of the day"; similarly they call the wrist "mother of the hand," tcué-huo; the abispa tic-lan [Enigmatic. The closest I can get to any logical meaning is "the tic-lan wasp," which is not helpful at all--Translator] they call "mother of the tic-lan, tic-lán-huu; and the beating of the pulse is "little heart," tdul-lecuáj.

The Mataco language may be lacking in certain particular sounds (articulations) but, on the other hand, it has a superfluity of other particular sounds (articulations). Among these latter the following stand out: quía, quié, quií, quío, quíu, and cquiá, and so forth, which together with others of similar sound are so frequent as to leave one in some doubt as to whether the language is not made up of the same syllable repeated a thousand times over in the same sense. We know already that quiá, quié etc. can change places with tzá, tzé and so forth, or with chiá, chié, etc., or with tchiá, tchié, etc. Furthermore the inversion of the constituent elements of a word is frequent, for example: "wide" is quü-tzaj-hu and also i-tzaj-quié -- it can therefore be readily understood to what extent Indian oratory can spread itself out and expand, as far as form goes, without really saying anything different. This sort of thing must be very generalized. General Mansilla in his outstanding book Una expedición a los Indios Ranqueles ["An expedition to the Ranquel Indians"--Translator] tells of having experienced this Indian fondness for repetitiveness, and I did also among the Tobas when we were harangued for half an hour and were really only told the same thing in several different ways according to Faustino the interpreter. 195 192 193

In their formation of compound words they follow the English and German usage; for example: "gloves," which are handschuhe in German, that is "hand shoes," are cqüéí-pbut among the Indians, that is "hand coverers." The same thing happens in negative sentences; example: "I do not see," is Ich sehe nicht in German and nu-ihenni-tde in Mataco, that is, "I see not," which is also precisely the manner of expression of the inhabitants of the areas surrounding Milan.

Chapter V

Augmentatives and Diminutives

Another thing which almost drove me to insanity was the nomenclature of the domestic animals which were introduced to America from Europe at the time of the discovery or conquest.

It is well known that when new things are introduced into previously unopened areas the names of these things are also introduced. It is also known that this fact has been of inestimable value, not only to philologists but also to ethnographers, that is, to those who deal with and study the distribution and description of the earth's peoples.

Very well then, -- it would happen that when I asked for the local names for horse, cow, sheep, etc., the Indians would answer with names which were absolutely different from the Spanish names.

Even now I get an urge to laugh when I remember the tortures to which I submitted the Mataco words in order to try to boil them down, by dint of hypothetical changes and shifts, to their Spanish roots.

I was fortunate enough one day to catch two pigeons in a trap.

We had on board with us a beautiful bulldog. In Mataco the word for dog is sinój, and we had named our dog Palomo ["pigeon"--Translator], which the Matacos [246] literally translated into their own language as ucquinataj. One day it happened that an Indian, on patting the dog, said, by way of expressing his admiration: Sinoj-tá́j! instead of Sinoj or Ucquinatá́j. I started then to realize that the particle taj expressed size of superiority, that it was a loose or floating affix, and that it could be added to or taken from other words in order to modify their meaning. I flew to my note books, leafed through the pages, ran through my lists of nouns, added taj to those which did not have it, and in an instant there sprang up before my eyes, to my immense satisfaction, the true, beautiful, philosophic, scientific etymologies of my quiuuasse-tá́j, "cow"; yelatá́j, horse; chí́onataj, "sheep"; quiuasset, "deer"; yelá́j, "tapir"; chionaj, "doe" -- with the famous taj which enlarges, ennobles and stretches them and declares them to be superior.

192
193

So it was that it suddenly dawned on me that in those words, which I had jotted down in their scores, and which ended in taj, I must eliminate that syllable, as also the famous uu or a or la, and tune my ear and sharpen my eye for the sounds which were basic and essential to each word. At the same time that I started to see this more clearly, I began to discover the genesis and the laws governing the word changes.

From there on a new region began to open up for me into which I readily and happily entered.

I hope that the reader will not become scandalized at this sort of enthusiasm which he may perceive in me. In my position he might well have experienced the same thing, for man is a slave to circumstances -- any Minister of State who becomes for a while a private soldier will take pleasure in noticing the look of approval from his corporal for a well executed "present arms"; as will the philosopher when praised by his lady for having helped her to untangle her skein of wool.

So how could a nobody such as I not feel pleasure on seeing, in his own hands, so to speak, a language which had been considered impoverished and of no account, take shape and flower into a methodical and elegant tongue?

Well,anyway -- these Matacos have an augmentative particle: taj, which is used to indicate physical, "moral" and descriptive qualities. So from ícnú, man, they form ícnú-taj, large man, from inót, "water," they form inót-táj "fire water" or brandy, and from ahló, pole or rod, they form ahlotáj-yacaré, "almost pole" or "nearly pole."

As a diminutive they sometimes use the particle quuáj and quiáj; for example: from colo, foot, they derive coló-quuáj, little foot; from cuéi, hand, they make cuéi-quiáj, little hand. They also use this latter term to indicate a person who is either lacking a hand -- or the whole arm -- or has a severe malformation in it. [The word "manco" in Spanish means any one of these--Translator.] So a chief called Manco in Spanish -- he actually lacked a hand -- was called in Mataco Cuéi-quuáj. This diminutive particle is also added to pronouns, a thing which cannot be done in Italian but can in Spanish, to wit: esa - esita ["That (feminine) one" -- "that little (feminine) one"--Translator] --which is very frequently used by country people.

192
193

These suffixes taj and quuaj and quiaj, although they are well defined particles, may nevertheless, and probably ought to, be considered as [247] inflections, for they mean nothing by themselves and furthermore it is they which are declined and not the words to which they are attached (1). And it is worth noting that

1. I find in my notes that taj is sometimes a shortened form of oitaj, meaning "almost."

in the matter of declension they follow a rule quite contrary to the one used for the suffixes corresponding to demonstrative pronouns; the same phenomenon which is encountered in French and Italian diminutives. Taj and quiaj, of which the plurals are tass and quiäss, divide and separate as do the demonstratives, for example: "box of matches" is itoj-ʾhi-cuass, that is "fire-box-little"; a case of incorporation (2).

2. In Mataco, "matches" is translated as "little fires," itoj-huaj (euphonic h in place of c), thus following our usage even in this detail.

Finally, it seems that they habitually place an i in front of a foreign word. For example the Spanish ñato ["snub nose"--Translator] becomes iñato, in which they coincide with the Mocoví Indians. It may be just a simple euphonic exigency.

Chapter VI

192
196

Some curious cases of onomatopoea and sound similarities.

Only very few words in this Indian language can be considered onomatopoetic, that is, imitative of the sounds they express. Which phenomenon of sound imitation is considered by some to be the origin of human language, developed later by man's intelligence.

To shout or yell is óhn; lightning is jlépp; dumb or mute is huó-huó; cough is cacojtáss; cricket is li-tzil; parrot is quie-quié

Chapter VII

Gender, Number, case, syncopation. Article?

a. Gender

It does not seem to me that the nouns have gender -- only in pronouns and in demonstrative adjectives are there to be found certain changes which make me suspect a gender differentiation. Yet this goes no further than the merest suspicion.

Withal, they do suffix the ending tzináˊ to the names of female animals, which means "female," and, when used alone and not attached to another word, means "woman"; for example, "mare" is yelaiáˊj-tzináˊ. In order to indicate a male animal they usually add asnáˊj, which actually means "male."

b. Number

I was so sure that these inhabitants of the Chaco must possess a plural formed by the joining or placing in close proximity of some word indicative of the concept of plurality, such as "much" or some other like word, that I was for ever in search of it. Actually there was nothing unnatural about such an idea -- the Guaraní Indians do in fact use such a linguistic device, heta, which placed beside a singular immediately imparts plurality to it; the Quichuas also do likewise by suffixing cuna, and these two nations of Indians are or were neighbors of the Matacos. Many other peoples use the self same artifice which is called agglutination; the Akka of Africa do so too.

It seemed therefore quite natural that the smaller should follow in the footsteps of the larger. Furthermore, is it not often stated that agglutination is common to the less advanced languages?

[249] It is a fact that in this case also it would seem as if the peoples who utilize this recourse are the least advanced -- actually this is very far from the truth.

In short, every language system has its weak points, which nevertheless do not detract from their basic usefulness among those who utilize it. It was therefore proper for me to accept this

linguistic canon as a sort of maxim.

However, the answers to my questions in which plurals were used were anything but satisfactory. Sometimes the plural of a word would end in one way, then another plural would end differently, and in all plurals there could be inserted a ntocq, meaning "much." What is more, just as all the rest of the expression varied, so also did one remain in the dark regarding the element connoting plurality. I would formulate my questions with numbers and the doubt still remained. For example: "Two horses?" I would ask, and the answer would come "horses two"; "two men?" "two icnú, icnul, or icnuíl." They appeared to be endings with different variations due to changes in pronunciation rather than to any other cause.

I repeat all this because it may be of some service to any of the many travelers who enjoy spending time among savages, either in Africa or in America. If they are not already too proud of their own knowledge and acumen it may stand them in good stead.

Meanwhile, I was surprised to gather that "we" and "you" [vosotros is 2nd person plural in familiar address--Translator] were formed directly from the singulars "I" and "thou" [tú, is 2nd person singular in familiar address--Translator] by means of the same affix. Thus, from noj-lám, meaning "I," noj-lám-il, "we," is derived; from am -- meaning "thou," they form ám-il, meaning "you" [2nd person plural--Translator] -- but in this case it was a matter only of those pronouns in which there are many rule exceptions. Nevertheless this very thing, by calling my attention to a given case, gave me the key to the riddle.

These Matacos not only have a plural which they form with ntocq -- "much," but also possess others which are arrived at in different ways and by means of assorted inflections. To sum up, they have divers declensions which are exclusive of each other and which hold, in a general way, to the following rules:

Words ending in either o or velar e add i to make the plural. Thus colo, meaning "foot," becomes coloi, "feet"; huentié, "little bird," becomes huentiéi, "little birds." Words ending in aj change j to ss -- in this category fall all the augmentatives ending in taj and all diminutives ending in quiaj, for

192
193

example: igüela -- "moon" or "month," becomes igüelass, "months"; yelataj -- "horse," becomes yelatass, "horses." Words ending in u take an l, which is pronounced by pressing part of the tongue against the palate and sounds like il, for example: cannú, meaning needle, becomes cannúl, almost cannuil, "needles." Words ending in t, oj and other letters take ess for the plural; thus: yápset, "fish," becomes yápsetéss, "fishes"; tdoj, "hide or skin," becomes tdojess, "hides." Words ending in l often add ess [sic.], sometimes losing the final l in the process; example: tzel, "belly," [250] tzeliss, "bellies"; yel meaning "a sick person" becomes yiss (or yéliss), "sick persons" -- this last being a fine example of shift.

Many exceptions have their place here too, of course, and probably other rules, but they are not included here so as to avoid becoming burdensome.

I am almost willing to believe that they have a dual approach to plurality as have the Araucano and Guaraní Indians, and the Greeks in Europe, but I cannot give any real assurance of it. To this effect I site from my notes: cqüéí -- the hand, cquéyai, both hands; noj-lamil -- we, noj-lamáss, we two; amil you [2nd person plural familiar --Translator], amass, you two. I repeat, however, that I am not sure but that it is a duplicated plural form.

As far as numerals go they can use, or not, as they see fit, a plural for following nouns, in which case use of a plural is, so to speak, redundant. Adjectives they do not pluralize, and they place them before nouns.

c. Case

I have not come across enough examples to allow me to affirm that this language has case declension unless one wishes to construe as such the genitive suffix ca. Here is an example of the use of this suffix: Peilo-ca-Uicquii, which means "Pedro's people." Their use of postpositions (corresponding to our prepositions) can be considered as cases.

In spite of this I must give fair warning that the personal pronouns "I" and "thou," at least in the singular, have case declension, while toj, meaning "this one" seems only to have an accusative toja.

R2
193

The declension of those pronouns which I have been able to glean are as follows:

Singular	Singular
Nom. I: nojlam, nu, no'ni.	Nom. Thou: am, or ham, and a
Gen. of me: noj-ca	Gen. Of thee: aj-cá
Dat. To me: nú-ho	Dat. To thee: ám-u or hám-u
Ac. Me: nuy-a or nu	Ac. Thee: ám-a and a-i
Ablat. With me: nuy-ej	Ablat. With thee: ám-ej or ám-quie.

Plural	Plural
Nom. We: noj, lam-il, na or inát	Nom. You [familiar]: am-il or a
Nom. [sic.] Us: noj, lam-áss and in-namáss	Nom. [sic.] You [familiar]: am-ass, or á

It is my opinion that the ending l and il must be some degeneration of the word el, which means "other" and which was originally used to express the plural, which plural is therefore [251] nothing else than a forgotten agglutinative form which has evolved by means of progressive alterations.

d. Syncopation

Syncopation is very common in this language, doubtless for reasons of euphony, but the alteration and confusion it brings about in words give rise to many errors and make the study of the language very difficult. For example: "Do you love me?" is Yajámín nuya, which is a shortened form of yaj-a-hemin nuya. "I do not love you" is Namahemin, which comes from Nu-am-a-hemin. I myself, shortly before writing these lines, thought that nam must mean "no," which then threw me into confusion because in this present example I could not find the particle nu,

192
193

expressive of the first person. Only after having checked and compared numerous sentences were my eyes opened to the real facts.

Chapter VIII

Regarding Negative Forms

The Mataco language contains a great many negatives which occupy various positions. It is curious to note their strange similarity to the Indian languages of North America spoken by nations which one would never have supposed to be related at all.

The most common of these negatives is ka, meaning "no," which can be used alone and also prefixed to adjectives thus contradicting the meaning of the word; for example: matt means "it is true," while ka-matt means "it is false." It is strange indeed that the Akkas, those so-called pygmies of Africa have this same word in their language with the same meaning "no," according to the grammatical essay of Abbot Beltrame of Verona.

Another negative particle is tdé, which is always suffixed, for example: mát -- "true"; matti-tdé, "false."

Note the extra i which is added to soften the word. These additions and eliminations of stray letters cause great difficulty and make the student of this language lose his way at every turn, despairing of ever getting to the end of his problems. Let us look at another example: nu-huen means "I have," hue-ni-tde, "I have not."

Then there is am, which is prefixed to verbs, as for example: n'am-huen, which signifies "I do not have." There also is yaj, which is both interrogative and imperative and is prefixed to verbs; it is the ne of the Latins, except for its position. Another negative particle is laja, which also means "without." Examples of the foregoing are: "Don't kill me," yaj-lon-nu; "Do you love me?", Yaj-a-hemin-nuya? "Widow" is laja-chiécuó-ya, that is, "husbandless one."

[252]

Chapter IX

Regarding Adjectives

192
193

a. Their usage

I have now before me the tangled problem of adjectives, comparatives, superlatives, numerals, and verb flections. There is no reason to prefer one to another and so I start with the one first mentioned.

One would think that adjectives ought to be like so many isolated plant stems, growing in such a way that a mere touch of the hand would be sufficient to turn them aside in order to pass easily by. Such is not the case. There are some which have their roots and even their branches so intertwined and enmeshed that one has need of an axe to untangle them.

There are a good many adjectives which are so rooted as to make it impossible to ascertain their beginning and their end -- in fact, most of the Mataco adjectives fall into this category. There are others, though, the geneology of which is quite evident. Among these are the possessives, which are formed from pronominal roots to which the particle ca, meaning "of," (also used as a genitive postposition) and co, which must be considered as a modification of ca, has been attached. In addition to ca and co they also use lo with the same possessives, especially, or so it seems to me, with "of mine," "of thine"; thus "of mine" (nuj) is nuj-ca, nuj-co, and nuj-lo; while "of thine" is ac-co and al-lo; and "whose?" ("of whom?") is atdec-lo.

Another way of forming these adjectives is with the addition of tzaj. For example: "fear" is uáí or huái and "fearful" is huain-tzaj. Another possibility is with ya, but this is really more like a present participle. Example: nu-huai-ya, means "I fearful," "that I am afraid"; acchecuoya means "that you have a wife" or "that you have a husband."

Yet another way is to place the postposition ej beside the noun. Example: "hunger" is na-in-ló; while "hungry one" is na-in lo nej, "now" is cquiá, (which literally means "fresh" or "new") and "of now," "as of now" is cquiá-yej.

192
193

And while on this subject of adjectives it is worth remarking that practically all those which express the opposite of some quality, usually of a good quality, are made up of the adjective denoting that quality plus a negative particle which either precedes or follows it. Thus, for example: "true" is matt, and "false," ka-matt or mattildé, that is to say "not true." "Good" and "pretty" or "nice" are hiss and tzî, while "ugly" is kat-zía and tzitdé; "far" is tocuery, "near," tocuei-tde, which can also be expressed by ca-tu-ta, in which catú means "elbow" and by analogy "curve," "around the corner," and so forth.

These negative particles are also used with nouns. For example: [253] "remedy" or "cure" is ckia, while poison is ka-ckía ("no remedy," "no cure"). Do we not find the same type of usage in our own languages when we say "uncertain" for "not certain" and "discourteous" for "not courteous"?

One might say, however, that these Indians lack certain refinements of which our language can boast and which tend to soften certain expressions, as for instance the subtle distinction between "false" and "not true," "far" and "not near."

[609]

Be that as it may, they still are not lacking in other distinctions, such as that existing between "stranger" and "foreigner." The former they call ajlu-taj-jlé-lé, which means "outsider," and the latter they call ic-quiomjlé-lé, that is, "he from below." And so he is, for from the Mataco point of view foreigners live "below," downriver and off past Paraguay. Upstream from them live the whites, whom they call Chihuéle.

Where did they get this word Chihuéle? Has it something to do with color? "White" is in their language pelaj, and "yellow," yaccatdé, that is, "not black," which proves that the opposite of black is for them yellow. Surely they do not consider us green or blue, however much their eyes may suffer from Daltonism. Can it be that they look upon us as red? This cannot be so either for red is icquiótt, which is a far cry from Chihuéle.

The actual fact is that Chihuéle means "good looking men."

192
193

Let us study this. Chí, as we have already stated, is the same as tzí, and also the same as quí. Now tzi is a root found in ka-tzi-a and in tzitdé which mean "not good" (or "not nice") and "good not" (or "nice not"). Furthermore it is to be found in tzilataj or chilataj, meaning "good," "nice." (The local whites, by the way, mispronounce the first part of this word and say chilátta). Chilatáj is made up, in the first place, of táj which is an augmentative particle, and Chíla. In the word Chíla, the la is a particle which, as was seen in the section treating lo, ca and co, if suffixed to the root has an adjective-forming function. So it is that Chí is the root giving the basic meaning to Chílataj. Chilataj, however, means "good," "nice" to a superlative degree, so that chi is indicative of "beauty."

We have seen that c-lelé is a word which means "which is of." Now, there can be no difficulty in accepting, for a language such as this one which sacrifices so many nuances of sound, that c-lelé has become modified and changed into güele or huéle by degeneration or because of some other shift the laws of which have not yet been discovered. Therefore Chihuéle is the same as Chic-léle, which means "those who are of the good (or nice, or goodlooking) ones," that is "The Goodlooking Ones."

I hope I may be forgiven for taking pleasure in an etymology which allows me to participate in, (although I do not deserve to) and be counted as possessing one of those four qualities declared by the Greek philosopher as indispensable for happiness, to wit: comfort, true friends, love of music and good looks [254] or to be considered so, which amounts to the same thing for all practical purposes.

Now amongst these Indians, even if one is somewhat ugly, one must yet, by comparison seem almost goodlooking, which is great -- are not these word forms therefore rational? They reveal a process of word formation by agglutination.

b. Regarding comparatives

In order to form the comparatives they use homo ehom, which means "more," together with taj, which expresses superiority.

These two words in a comparison are not joined by any equivalent to our "than" [In Spanish comparatives are formed with de or que; the foregoing "than" does not fully translate these terms--Translator.], such as in the following example: "Peter is a better boy than Paul," because they, in this case, would also say, by means of a circumlocution: "Peter is a better boy than Paul is not." This is a somewhat strange construction, but I find that it crops up repeatedly in my notes. Very often the particle ya follows the comparative, which leads me to believe that there are other comparative forms, although I have not discovered them as yet.

c. Regarding the Superlative

To form the superlative they habitually use ntócq which means "much," as is the custom in so many other tongues. They sometimes lengthen the sound of a syllable. For example: "far" is tocuéy; "very far" is tocuéey, the word being accompanied by appropriate gestures. This is also customary amongst the Araucanos and we ourselves use it in certain cases. It is quite natural and logical.

Another way of arriving at a superlative construction is by affixing a to the positive -- for instance: the comparative of the Indian word "his," which means "nice, pretty," is ha-is, "very pretty, very nice"; tocuéy, far, becomes a-tocuéy, very far.

As I have already said they have an augmentative taj and a diminutive quiaj or cuaj, particles which are suffixed and which are declinable while the noun to which they are attached remains unalterable -- their declension consists in changing j to ss for the plural.

In order to say "less" they use yaj-lom, which is the same as yaj-lehom, that is "no more," made up of the particle le plus hom; another example of agglutination, common in this type of adjective. This language is apparently extraordinarily logical, and once having started out in a given direction persists in it to the end. The problem then, in the first place, is to understand this construction, and then to keep from losing sight of it in its many twists and turns. [255]

Indians manage by means of a similar artifice, at least with some of their numerals such as "ten" or "twenty" in place of which they say "two hands" and "two hands and two feet." And it is probable that, should we analyze the etymologies of numerals among other Indians and other nations, we would find something similar. What shall we say of Roman numerals? Do they not represent as many fingers as are needed to count up to three, and a whole hand for five (V) and a hand minus a finger for four (IV), and two superimposed hands -- one being inverted -- for the (X)? It is quite clear that Roman written numerals are to Arabic numerals what hieroglyphs are to writing and what Mataco numeral expression is to the spoken tongue.

It is precisely from nature that man must first have derived the first instruments for expressing his needs and for the development of his ideas.

Chapter XI

Pronouns and Pronominal Particles (1)

192
193

1. Interpolated chapter.

a. Personal Pronouns

The most commonly used personal pronouns are the following:

	Singular	Plural
1.	I - no-j-lam	1. We - no-j-lam-il; no-j-lam-ass (dual?)
2.	Thou - ám, hám	2. You (familiar form) am-il and am-ass (dual?)
3.	This one - tój	3. Those ones toj-ess.

I also have come upon inat, inená and innamáss as plural first person pronouns.

b. Pronominal Particles

192
193

These particles are prefexed to nouns and verbs in every case where the state or action refers to persons; which is why they are so frequently encountered, to the extent that in a dialogue there is hardly a word to which they are not affixed. This phenomenon, added to the elision to which their vowels fall heir when brought into contact with the vowels of the words which they precede, often produces the illusion that they are part of the root of those words.

These particles are as follows in singular and plural, for nouns and verbs:

1st My (singular object), My (plural object), Our (singular object) Our (plural object), I and Us: no, nu, ni, na.

2nd Thy (singular object), Thy (plural object), Your (familiar plural form with singular object), Your (familiar plural form with plural object), Thou and You (objective) -- a, ha.

3rd Of his, of theirs, that one, those ones -- lo, lu, le.

In addition to these particles of relation they customarily use others which are also prefixed to a given word root and which give the absolute or general meaning to the expression. The particles are more frequently t and l, and often la. For example: "flame of fire" is itoj-cúáca; "flame" (in general) is la-cúáca; "hut door" is huet-pè, while "door" (in general) is la-pé or hla-pé.

c. Demonstrative Pronouns

Singular	Plural
This one -- Toj	These ones -- Toj ess
and Toj-tzi,	and Toj-ess-tzi,
Toj-chi	Toj-ess-chi
and Toj-qui.	and Toj-ess-qui
That one yonder -- Toj-licné	These ones yonder -- Toj-ess-licné
That one -- Toj-láni and	Those ones -- To.-ess
Toj-léc-ti	

192
193●

In combination, toj or toj-ess precede and tzí, etc., licné, lani etc., follow the word or phrase.

d. Interrogative Pronouns

Who? -- adhéj or âdej.
What? -- atde or hat dezu. [260]

e. Reflexive Pronouns

J-lam -- suffixed -- meaning "same," (the Latin met) is used as personal pronoun and is the root element in the adverbs j-lam-mej, which means "always."

Chapter XII

Regarding Verbs

a. General Observations

The verbs are the really difficult elements in this language to nail down. I confess my ignorance; I cannot even point out an infinitive, an infinitive that is, which I can be absolutely sure is an infinitive. It might be, if I had sufficient time, that I could get to the bottom of the problem but I just do not have enough time to work on it at present. I must add, however, in defense of my good name, that the fault does not lie entirely with my limited intelligence but rather is in greater part due to the many intricacies of this wretched language and to the absolute lack of even the vaguest idea of grammatical forms on the part of my Indian interpreters. When, for example, one asks them how to say "to eat," they are at a loss for an answer, or else give a different answer every time they are confronted with the question. One must ask them how to say "I want to eat," and then "let's eat" and in this way lead them gently to the basic question. And then one comes up against a solid wall,

192
193

for "to eat" together with "to want" is expressed by a special form which includes both ideas. And so it goes.

And then there are the different forms and ways of saying things. For instance, Spanish for yo tengo ("I have") reproduces the French c'et a moi and the Latin id est mihi, and one must run the risk of saying that es ("is") means tengo ("have"). Well, it seems that these Indians have some of these idiomatic expressions too.

And what will the reader think if I say that I have not even been able to discover the plural of verbs? There is a particle en or hen, according to the ending of the word which precedes it, which undoubtedly expresses plurality, but I do not know whether it is a pronominal particle or rather a real verbal inflection. For example: "dance" [singular, imperative--Translator] is catin and "dance" [plural, imperative--Translator] is catinén. So far so good, but let us look further -- "let us dance" is inát-catin, in which the en has become lost and inát meaning "we," has appeared, but in an analogous case this does not happen at all -- for instance: "touch" [singular, imperative--Translator] is hen quié, while "let us touch," is inénhequién, in which there are a number of changes for reason of euphony and pronunciation ease [261] but among which there can easily be distinguished, in the background, the en which had disappeared in "let us dance." This, in itself, would not be a serious problem for it might mean only that there were two plural forms. The real trouble lies in that if we combine the example with subject and object we notice that hen or en agrees with the object and not with the subject, the verb never taking on a passive or neuter quality as happens with certain Latin verbs such as videor, loquor, etc.

For example: "kill [imperative, singular--Translator] the sheep (sing.)" is l-lón tzonatáj; "Peter has killed the sheep (sing.)" is Peiló ilón tzonataj; "Peter has killed the sheep (plural) is Peiló ilonén tzonatáss. Where now is the rule which required the particle en in "dance" (imperative, plural), "let us dance," etc.? This type of confusion crops up dozens of times.

Another confusing example: iloje means to cure; iil means "the sick (one)" but in order to render "the Indians are curing the sick" into the Mataco language one must say uicquiei ilojeje tojiilnen. Where does the "rule of incorporation" begin and where does it end in this sentence?

192
193

So all I can say with any certainty is that en and hen are more often than not found in conjunction with plurality. I say more often than not because it is not always so. For example: "The whites have killed a sheep" is Tsiguuéle tzonataj. Apparently this plural construction with en is not used with the verb except when the object of the action of that verb is plural, or when the plural subject of the verb is one which receives the verb's action, as for instance in "to dance." This seems to indicate that in the syntax of these verbs there is a great difference when compared to ours. There is possibly a similarity in some chases to English verbal usage -- i.e., "I am told," "We are told" etc., in place of "They have told me," "They have told us," which is analogous, after all to the Latin neuter in videor, etc.

b. Regarding Tenses

To judge from the welter of verb forms which I have before me I think I can give assurance that this language has many conjugations. On this score it would be similar to Guaraní, which also has many, and would be very different from the Araucano language, which has only one, and also from the Quichua which likewise, or so it seems to me, has only one -- though an extremely complicated one in compound tenses.

From all the foregoing the reader will gather that I cannot possibly present one or more types of verb conjugations because I have not been able to describe them. Despite this, however, I am in a position to give some forms for a few of the tenses.

One of the more exact of these is the future, which is expressed by means of the present plus a final syllable la. For example: "he returns" is tapil, while "he will return" is tapil-la. This is what might be called the absolute future, for there is another future which I shall call the dubitative and which is formed with the addition of pbiye, which means "may be," this being added at the end. The lá future form is also used to [262] connote duty or obligation to do something, which is also true of our language.

Another form is the past, which consists of adding é to the present form preceded by a repetition of the last letter of the present tense form -- for it is one of this language's idiosyncracies to repeat certain letters, as is done in Italian and so many others, with the

192
193

exception of Spanish. Example: "he arrives" is yom, while "he has arrived" is yommé.

The remote past or preterite, however, is formed by placing the adverb of time náji or náje next to the present, the n being replaced by another letter, usually l, if it falls pleasantly on the ear. For example: "he kills" is ilóm, while "he killed" (preterite) is ilonnaje. Sometimes aje alone is added, as for instance: "he eats"--théuccue, "he ate" -- théu quáje.

Another way of forming the immediate past (which almost corresponds to the imperfect) is by adding nenna, which they use either whole or else reduced to one or other of its two syllables according to the speakers personal whim.

These two words náje and nénna are the same ones which are used in the word "yesterday" -- icuala-náje and "today" -- icuala-nenná; (see how logical these savages are), and, as is the case with the future lá, are set off from the verbal element proper in order to allow for the addition of some infix or other, which may even be a whole phrase.

c. Regarding Personal Flections

It would seem, to judge from the above examples, as if the language of these Indians were totally lacking in verbal endings which had anything to do with persons, although they are -- to a certain extent -- related to number by means of the suffix en. However, be it because of a merely casual pronunciation difference, be it intentional and related to the person of the verb, the fact is that I find the e changed to i in the first person of the past tense in the following examples: "I arrived" -- yammi; "I returned" -- tapini; "I ate" (remote past or preterite) -- tdeucquáji. But it happens anyway, that these changes in verbs to agree with the person concerned are not needed for each has a pronominal prefix attached to it, to wit: nu, a, lo, inat, which correspond to "I," "thou," "he," "we," etc., which undergo certain variations such as: no and ni, lu and li, inné, and I don't remember which others.

However, in negative usage, which is formed with the suffix tde, meaning "no," the word seems to take on a sort of flectional form, but this is to be attributed solely to the desire for euphony. For example: "I see" -- nu huenn; "I do not see" -- nu-huenni-tdé, instead of nuhenntdé; "short" is isset or nisset while "not short" is

192
193

nu yissti tdé, rather than nuissetde; "is he dead?" is yáj iil?, and "he is not dead" is yini tde, instead of yill tdé.

I do not go into further details because I would continually find it necessary to become embroiled in forms about which very little is known as to their differentiations -- and these variations become all the more numerous as the [263] relations which are treated become more complex. Let us take a single example, and that from among the more elementary ones. "Did the Chief (mine) return?" is Yaj tapil-le nucaunía?; "He did not return" -- Tapini-tdé. In this very simple example, why do we have in one instance le, and in the other ni? The interrogative is concerned only with the first part, that is, with yaj. In my opinion it is quite clear that these changes are the result of an aural whim, and I believe that I can almost say that tapil-le is a substitution caused by the nu which follows tapilné, which is in turn a syncopation of tapil-nenná; and so also with tapi ni. Now ab uno disce omnes.

d. Regarding Reflexive Verbs

They seem to form some reflexive verbs by juxtaposing j-lam to the active form. For example: "Pedro killed himself" is Peiló tilonne j-lam. This j-lam translates the Latin met and our own "--self." So the personal pronoun nojlam could be "ego met," that is, "I myself," which would cause it to harmonize more closely with the other pronominal elements. I must make clear here that my references, both here and elsewhere, to Latin are not efforts to establish any sort of analogy whatsoever -- I only do so in an effort to make my report more clear.

e. Regarding Verbs in General

It is worthwhile noting how certain verbs whose meaning has become modified keep to their original root. For example: "to walk" is opil, "to return" is tapil; "to come" is nom, "to arrive" is yom; "to die" is iil, "to kill" is ilón; "to shout, call out, say" is ohn, to speak hon and hon-quié (that is "to speak with") corresponds to our "to converse," which is one more proof, in my opinion,

192
193

of the Indians' quick wit and logical inclination. These expressions could give us the key to the modifying value of certain particles, from which much would be gained regarding the philosophy of language (as in hon-quié) and comparative philology, as in ta-pil, in which t represents repetition of an action -- as retracing one's steps does indeed imply -- and which is found with this meaning in the Araucano language, and, for that matter in ours also as for instance agitar [meaning "to shake" or "agitate"--Translator] from agere, and the Italian seguitare ["To follow"--Translator] which is seguir in Spanish; and there are dozens of other examples.

However, it is by means of postpositions that the vast majority of verbs are formed. We have already given the examples tol-l-ca, "to come from"; tol-l-pe, "to fall from," tol-l-equíote "to fall into," all of which are derived from tol-l, a word of movement. And I am positive that, according to this rule, if I were to say toll-quie (quie is the same as cum -- "with," as in "company") in place of "to accompany" or "to go with," these Indians would understand me. Further examples? "Peter is dying of hunger" is Peilo il-lej nainló (ej means "with" in an instrumental sense). And in order to [264] convince the reader that ej in this case is not a preposition of nainló, "hunger," let us see the following example: "The Indians are dying of hunger" is Uicquii yil ej-i-én nainló, that is yille-ej-én, in which ej precedes en, a suffix of the plural verb which is, naturally, attached and suffixed to the latter and not prefixed to the noun. It is therefore not a "preposition" as we shall call it when we study this part of speech.

This type of preposition usage, together with the other changes and variations of which we have so often complained, is not the least of the causes which make for confusion and difficulty in the study of verbs. And in actual fact, what activities can escape the possibility of being expressed by a verb which covers the basic idea and a postpositional particle which assigns a relation to it? Very few indeed. And very few also are the words which do not have one or other of these disguised insertions which crop up now here, now there, now somewhere else and in a different guise, according to the aural requirements of the moment, and which flabbergast the hearer and surprise and confuse him with their inexplicable changes and variations.

One of the verbal forms for expressing actions which include the idea of possession is that of placing ya next to the word which

192
193

expresses the thing possessed. For example: "woman" is chiecua, "to have a woman (or wife)" is chiecuaya; "fear" is huái', "to be afraid (to have a fear)" is huáya. Another way of indicating possession is as follows: "son" is loss, while "to have sons" is lo lessen; "daughter" is either lo-se or le-ctza, and "to have daughters" is lolesses; "brother" is quiilaj, and "to have brothers" is quiilaliss.

The verb "to be" is not expressed. For example: "I am ugly" is nu-tzi-tdé, which literally means "I goodlooking not."

d. Examples of Verbal Flections

I shall put an end to this very boring matter of the verbs (it has been so for me, I must confess, although I hope it has not for the reader!) by attempting to put together and set down one of the verb conjugations for the indicative mood. I do not guarantee the details -- you already know why -- but I believe that in general it may be accepted as summing up what I know on the subject.

VERB: Ilon -- "to kill."

INDICATIVE MOOD

	Present Tense	Remote Past (Preterite)
Singular:	1. I kill -- nu-ilón	1. I killed -- nu-ilon-náje
	2. Thou killest -- há-ilon	2. Thou killedest -- ha-ilon-náje.
	3. He kills -- l-ilón	3. He killed -- l-ilon-náje or t-ilon-náje

[265]

Plural:		
1.	We kill - inat-ilón-én	1. We killed -- inat-ilonnajién
2.	You kill -- há-ilon-en	2. You killed -- ha-ilonnajién
3.	They kill -- tojéss-ilon-én	3. They killed -- tojéss-ilonnajién.

192
193

IMPERFECT TENSE

Singular: 1. I was killing -- nu-ilonnénna
2. Thou wert killing -- ha-ilonnénna
3. He was killing -- l-ilonnénna

Plural: 1. We were killing -- inat-ilonnénnahén
2. You were killing -- ha-ilonnénnahén
3. They were killing -- tojéss-ilonnénnahén.

PAST PERFECT

Singular: 1. I have killed -- nu-ilonné
2. Thou hast killed -- ha-ilonné
3. He has killed -- le-ilonné
Plural: 1. We have killed -- inat-ilonnehén
2. You have killed -- ha-ilonnehén
3. They have killed -- tojéss-ilonnehén

FUTURE

Singular: 1. I shall kill -- nu-ilón-lá
2. Thou wilt kill -- ha-ilón-lá
3. He will kill -- l-ilón-lá
Plural: 1. We shall kill -- inát-ilon-lá-hen
2. You will kill -- ha-ilon-lá-hen
3. They will kill -- tojéss-ilon-lá-hen.

IMPERATIVE

kill - l-lon.

Let it be understood that the preterite form with náje is used only very rarely, and even less so is the nenná form used.

Do these people have a passive form to their verbs? I don't know. Yet I have noticed that many of the constructions using the passive in the Romance languages are changed about by them

192
193

and rendered into an active form, or at least an intransitive one.

For example: instead of saying "Paul was killed by Pliny," they say "Pliny died because of Paul [sic]" or else "Pliny killed Paul."

I don't think, really, that this necessarily points up an inferiority in their language.

By no means let it be thought that the verbs in this language are easy and simple by virtue of the above conjugation table. It is, in fact, just because they are so jumbled and involved that I am not able to give further moods or tenses, which are so terribly complicated that even now I do not have a firm grasp of their governing rules.

Chapter XIII

Regarding Adverbs

There are a great many adverbs, but those involving time stand out because of the logical manner of their formation which parallels the way in which we form them in our own language. For example: "day" is icuála, which actually means "sun" or "one sun," just as "month" is igüeláj, which literally means "moon"; "beside" [266] is tem-ló; náje, náji or naj mean "past," and also "afterward," in the sense of past time; nenna and na mean "present, now" -- so (quite logically) "today" is icuálanná, that is "present sun"; Spanish mañana is icuála and also quiicuála, in the same way that in Spanish mañana means both "morning" and "tomorrow"; "yesterday" is icuálannáje, that is "the past sun"; "the day before yesterday is icuála el-láje, which means -- since el means "other" and láje is the same as náje -- "the other past sun." Because of some change or harmonious feeling or custom in the language, "the day after tomorrow" is tem-lo icuála, which signifies "beside tomorrow." It is curious that tem-ló is prefixed to icuála to express the idea of a day later and yet náje is suffixed when expressing the idea of a day earlier. Quirks of the language apparently, and yet they must answer to some etymological, not to say philosophical, reason, which resides in their changed position.

Then we must remain in it. But then, my dear reader, if there is still one whom I can call thus, be benevolent to me and my unfortunate work. I beg you for the sake of the love I have for you and of the love I hope you have for me... because of those hours I have stolen from Morpheus while thinking of you and trying to untangle the most intricately intertwined Mataco mesh which has been until now virgin; and I beg you -- even by the mockery which I myself feel falls upon me as I appear to neglect the exact roots of mathematics for the last analysis, believe me, some good may [268] come from all this at a time when you may wish to study a little of the prehistoric history of this people to be found here in South America -- for with the tiny light afforded by philology we may well attempt to discover whether these Redskins were at least as closely related to each other as we are to the Croats. And if this is not reason enough for you..... miserere mei.

Chapter XIV

Regarding Prepositions

193 ●

Prepositions in this language as in so many others make up, to a great extent, the base and, so to speak, the philosophy of the language. Placed next to a verb they lend a relational meaning. And yet they are themselves so lacking in clarity and fixity that not long before writing these lines I had marvelled at the apparent paucity of prepositions in this tongue. In this language the very opposite is true of what occurs in the Quichua tongue in which prepositions are truly beautiful, set off from other words, clear, always in the same position -- that is, placed after their object, for which reason they should be called postpositions and not prepositions.

In Mataco the prepositions are also postpositions, but sometimes they are not placed immediately after the noun but after the verb, and are then often mistakenly supposed to be a form of the conjugation, which error I also fell into. Sometimes also they are placed between the verb root (if we may be allowed to use such a term here) and the flectional tense ending, or between a noun root and the ending which is indicative of plurality or case. One

can easily imagine then the horrible confusion confronting the neophyte who is faced with a pile of expressions belonging to a completely new and strange language in which a given word seems to change and be different every time it is used, and for no apparent reason. I for my part confess that for a long time I was unable to understand it and even now I own that I have been able to track down only very few of the rules which govern these changes and which lie hidden among the hundreds of sentences which I have written down.

For example: cue is equivalent to "with"; "we" is, in its abbreviated form nu hén; "with us" is nu cue hén.

Of course, the problem would not be difficult if one could ask an Indian a question regarding an isolated word and he were able to answer in an absolute way. But the Indian, more times than not, has need always to refer the word to some thing. Thus, when one asks him how one says "foot" in his language he will answer ñuccolo if he touches his own foot; accolo if he touches the questioner's foot; toccolo if he touches the foot of some third person. Then there is the confusing problem of [269] different construction. For example: in the above mentioned case of nuccuenen, if one asks the interpreter which is the part which means "with" and which the part corresponding to "us" he will answer (if he is intelligent and knows the language) quite naively: nuc means "with," and cuehen is "us" -- precisely the opposite to what is actually the case.

So it is that there is nothing for it but to go forward slowly and step by step, from the known to the unknown, inquiring first after single words, then after simple, clear sentences, then after less simple but still clear ones, and finally, by dint of repeating the same sentence with slight changes of one word or some one of its parts we shall in all probability, manage, by a simple process of elimination, to arrive at the meaning of each word. And yet even this is not enough for, owing to the properties inherent in this language which I have pointed out elsewhere, owing to the great intellectual distance between the interlocutors, and to the different points of view to which they hold because of mutual ignorance, the wretched student suddenly finds himself face to face with an old word in a new disguise, not knowing why or how or when the change came about and wondering which of the two forms is the

correct or original or basic one. His first reaction is to redouble his efforts and multiply his questions, and thus very often he only redoubles his confusion until he finally ends up by producing a veritable Babel....

192 193

And since we have mentioned Babel, I must remark that the Vielas [sic] Indians translate the word "speak" by the term mbabelon.

But now let us return to our prepositions. It is often said that these prepositions modify the meaning of verbs, but it would be closer to the truth to say that they merely complement them. For example: Tol-l carries with it the idea of movement. When used alone it may mean "to sprout": thus "the grass sprouts" is expressed thus: "grass, tol-l. With the addition of ca at the end it means "to come from," and if ppé is added it means "to fall." Other words are not lacking which express the same thing, however if we want to use tol-l then these particles, which are used as postpositions, must be placed next to the nouns.

It might be supposed, when these prepositions are suffixed to verbs, that they are really prefixes of the objective case; but in spite of the fact that there are some prepositions which are prepositions in every sense of the word, nevertheless, in the above cases they act postpositionally even with verbs, because they modify the latters' endings in accord with their sound, because the verbs thus modified can be used alone -- for other words can be inserted between it (together with its postposition) and the objective case -- which demonstrates that the postposition is attached to the verb.

The main particles, or at least the one which I judge to be so, and which act as do our prepositions are: eckiá -- "until"; tamennej -- "because of"; appé, pé or ppé -- "on top of"; (h)icquió -- "below"; cue, quié, ycque, ecque, ej -- "with" (these are probably one and the same, but modified for reasons of euphony); uuith, uuitd and c-loya, which also [270] mean "with" and are prefixed and are rather to be considered copulative conjunctions; op, ob, "hot," hlot -- "for," and which I have only come across with the meaning of "because," for example: op-toj -- "because" ("for this"); op-qui-lá -- "what for?", while in order to say "why?" they use atddeyéque? which is made up of atde meaning "what" or "how" and yécque -- "with." There is also the postposition ei which is

192
193

like the Italian da and the French chez, and is used for movement to or from a place (the latter often being omitted) and is placed in diverse positions. This ei or iei is part of a most elegant verbal expression: miei, meaning "fetch," composed of móh or mmóh which means "go" and ei (the whole having undergone one of the numerous shifts which are so common to this language and used to drive me to desperation). For example: Instead of saying "go and bring me fire" (itoj) they say miéi-itoj, which is "fetch me fire." At first, and even after I had been working on the language for some time, I thought it was a flection.

Another important postposition is ca which means "of" (genitive and ablative) and is suffixed to both verbs and nouns. With these latter it forms a sort of genitive which I find is used somewhat rarely and then only with proper nouns. With personal pronouns it forms the possessives "my," "thy," "his," which in this tongue are genitive -- if they can be called such -- and follow the same rule as genitives do in Italian in which one may just as readily say "mine" as "of me." So from nu (which is a syncopated form of nojlam -- "I") they derive nujcá -- "my"; ah-ca -- "your," luh-cá -- "his," "of him."

There are other postpositions also: cquí, "within"; lája, which means "without" and is a prefix, and which is a word of negation, for I do not find it prefixed to any words other than those ending in a way which indicates denied possession. For instance, "wifeless" is lája chequó yá, that is "not married."

There are so many others that I cannot possibly recall them all.

The words that express our "with" (ecq, yc-que) lead me to believe that some postpositions govern certain cases and that the varied endings of the latter cause the apparent change in the prefix. For example, "me" is nuya; "with me" is nuyécque -- from which one can easily conclude that a shift has taken place from nuya yécque. And does not the same thing happen in Italian when instead of saying con lo, con la, con li, we say col-lo, col-la, col-li, and in place of di-lo, di-la we say del-lo, del-la?

While on this subject of postpositions, let the reader not marvel on seeing that in Mataco the order is completely different from our own. On the contrary, the shoe is on the other foot for it would be more to the point if he marvelled at our usage, for this business of suffixing the particles which we prefix must be considered as having been the universal norm at one time.

So it is that in German and in English, but especially in the former [271] the transposition of prepositions is quite frequent and is one of the elements which most contribute to language elegance -- not to speak of difficulty for those who wish to learn it starting from one of the so-called Latin group. At least the main difficulty lies there in my opinion, without mentioning the dissimilarity of the words themselves.

In Latin we have examples of prepositional transposition in the following: nobiscum, vobiscum, tecum, mecum and in the interchangeable position of such words as "versus, it being possible to say "I am going 'Romam versus' and 'versus Romam'." And this sort of usage carries over even to conjunctions so that one may say Senatus atque Populus Romanus or Senatus Populusque Romanus which has remained as Rome's famous motto. In Italian we have meco and feco to which the Spanish pleonasm con-migo and con-tigo correspond.

The examples which I have just cited can, in my opinion, be considered as vestiges of preexistant forms.

In South America's Indian languages, postpositions rather than prepositions are the order of the day, and the contrary is only an exception, at least in Quichua and Guarani, which have only postpositions, and in Araucano which makes use of both forms. The above mentioned Indians, together with the Matacos and savage Chaco and Central tribes, occupy all of South America.

May it not be that this form is more useful than ours in contributing to a quick perception of ideas, the main term being expressed first while the changeable particle is attached later? Of course, one of these small particles does not retard appreciation of the relation between the two terms very much, but nevertheless, if we go back and look at the period in which languages had their birth, does it not seem more natural to give first place to the concrete objects and only then express the relationship between them?

suffixing of artificial particles in the interrogative: chu at the end of verbs, and taj at the end of nouns.

For example: "Do you want?" is munanqui? and "water" (accusative) is yacuta. If one were to ask: "Do you want water?", this would be munanquichu yacuta?; "you are called" is sutiqui, and "how" is ima. In order to ask "How (what) are you called?" one must say imataj sutiiqui, one sound -- if spoken -- or calligraphic symbol -- if written -- being economized.

Let it be noted that in Quichua all particles are suffixed, be they conjunctions, prepositions, interrogatives, declensions. This makes of it an exceptionally [sic] typical language.

Chapter XV

Regarding Conjunctions

I have not found a single disjunctive conjunction such as "or," "neither," etc. Instead of "or" they appear to use "if not," and in place of "neither" they seem to repeat the verb. For example, they say "Give me water if there is no wine" instead of "give me [273] water or wine." And also: "I have no water, I have no wine" instead of "I have neither water nor wine."

Conversely, they have many words to express copulative conjunctions such as "and," "also," etc., all of which they prefix, as we do. The more important of this type of conjunction are, it seems to me: uuith or uuitd and c-loya which they use for our "with," as has already been seen, and utcuei, isiqiei, tdéui, which correspond to our [blank left here, but probably "and" was intended--Translator].

I notice that tdéui is used especially in interrogative phrases such as: "I am leaving, and you?" -- Nu-ycque, tdeui am? They have the conditional conjunction "if," which is quiá or cquiá. When a conditional proposition is placed before the main proposition, the latter is joined to uuitd, just as so is used after wenn in German, or cosi in Italian. For example: "If you do not want to, let me know" is cquia ("you do not want to") uuitd ("let me know").